

Appln. No. 10/676,261
Amd. dated April 19, 2006
Reply to Office Action of March 21, 2006

REMARKS

The examiner considers the claims to be directed to four distinct inventions (Groups I-IV) and requires restriction to a single invention.

Applicant elects without traverse Group I, presently comprising claims 1-4, drawn to an isolated population of bone marrow cells. The dependence of claim 2 from claim 1 was inadvertently omitted in the original claims. As presently amended, claim 2 is dependent from claim 1 and is now drawn to the same isolated population of bone marrow cells, as was originally intended. Therefore, claim 2 should be examined with elected Group I.


Elected Group I is directed to a product and it is understood that when a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claims will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP §821.04.

Favorable consideration and early allowance are respectfully solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By


Allen C. Yun
Registration No. 37,971

ACY:pp
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\N\nyum\HUSSAIN1A\PTO\amendmentOA3-31-06.doc